

REMARKS

Claims 2-3 are pending in the application. Claim 1 was canceled and replaced by new claim 3 which more particularly points out and distinctly claims the present invention.

Drawings

In response to the Examiner's drawing objection, a "PRIOR ART" legend was added to Figure 6.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Takats et al. (Takats) and JP 64-041498. For at least the reasons set forth below, withdrawal of all outstanding rejections as they relate to the amended claims is respectfully requested.

1. Present Invention

The present invention provides "active-standby" control. In normal operation, a first actuator is controlled by a control signal, and a second actuator is just followed to the wing as a "standby" state. The second actuator does not positively actuate the wing. To bring the second actuator into the standby state, a follower signal is sent to the second actuator. The claimed "follower mode position," "follower signal generating part," and "follower signal" are all related to this following function.

2. Takats

Takats discloses "active-active" control. In contrast to the present invention, in normal operation, both actuators A and B in Takats are active (i.e., driven). That is, neither actuator is in a standby state. Since both actuators are active, there is no "follower" function in Takats.

The Examiner has equated the output of the microprocessor 116 as providing a follower signal. However, both outputs of the microprocessor 116 lead to actuator B, which is active in the normal mode. Thus, there is no "follower mode" in Takats, the microprocessor 116 cannot be

a “follower signal generating part,” and neither of the microprocessor outputs can be “follower signals.”

Takats also provides an “active-bypass” state when both channels fail (column 3, lines 37-43). However, there is also no following function in the “active-bypass” state.

3. JP 64-041498

JP 64-041498 discloses two independent control systems A and B. Two servo mechanisms 50A and 50B are controlled independently, and two different failure detection control circuits 41A and 41B are provided. When a failure is detected in one actuator system (A or B), the servo valve in the failed system is opened (oil circuit becomes a “bypass” state) so that the failed system does not affect the operation of the other system.

In JP 64-041498, the first control system does not send a follower signal to the second actuator. Thus, there is no “follower mode” in JP 64-041498.

4. Patentability of independent claim 3 over Takats

Claim 3 recite, in part, the following limitations (underlining added for emphasis):

the first control unit further including a follower signal generating part which generates a follower signal by which the second actuator is followed with the wing, the follower signal generating part sending the follower signal to the second switching signal device

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner equates the claimed “first control unit” with the “primary controller 100” in Takats, and the claimed “follower signal generating part” with the microprocessor channel 1B (116), as shown in Fig. 4A of Takats.

As discussed above, there is no “follower” mode in Takats, and thus Takats cannot disclose or suggest any of the above-highlighted limitations. Accordingly, claim 3 is believed to be patentable over Takats.

5. Patentability of independent claim 3 over JP 64-41498

Claim 3 is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as given above with respect to Takats, namely that JP 64-41498 fails to disclose or suggest a "follower signal generating part" or a "follower signal."

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner equates a follower part with the line in Fig. 3 of JP 64-41498 from electrical control circuit 49a to control valve 46Ba. However, as discussed above, no follower mode is described in JP 64-41498, and thus this line cannot read on the above-highlighted claim limitations. Accordingly, claim 3 is believed to be patentable over JP 64-41498.

6. Patentability of dependent claim 2

Dependent claim 2 is believed to be patentable over the applied references for at least the reason that it is dependent upon allowable base claim 1 and because it recites additional patentable elements.

Conclusion

Insofar as the Examiner's rejections were fully addressed, the instant application including all pending claims is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowability of all pending claims is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Teruaki Tanaka et al.

May 31, 2006
(Date)

By: Clark A. Jablon
CLARK A. JABLON
Registration No. 35,039
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
One Commerce Square
2005 Market Street - Suite 2200
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Direct Dial: (215) 965-1293
Facsimile: (215) 965-1210

CAJ/gem